is strong in the pulpit," they say. And no one who has heard the Moderator doubts that he has an unequivocal message of tremendous reach and import—an evangel for our day and age. He has been very active in evangelism, in his own parish and in the church at large, as a member of the General Assembly's Committee on Evangelistic Work ever since its organization. He preaches the Word of God in its richness. He uplifts the Kingship of Jesus. This ability has gathered about him an adult Bible Class, noted from sea to sea. But others remember the pastor who has entered their homes with a loving heart, so tender that you know he feels your sorrow and rejoices in your joy. He has kept the heart of youth that wins youth, and makes the old forget their years. He is one of those men whom God has placed in this world to be a friend to all who need befriending. These qualities, fellow interest in his comrades and helpfulness on the one hand, and keen interest in his preaching, characterized the young man even in seminary days. He was brother and leader in one. And the years have only mellowed and ripened the promises of early life.

Dr. Carson has the usual diversity of interests that we expect today in our leading churchmen. He was one of the active founders of the Stony Brook Association that offers Winona privileges to the people of the Atlantic Coast. He is a writer of books. Even as moderator he continues as a regular contributor to the Presbyterian Sunday School publications. His wisdom and foresight are at the disposal of schools, colleges, and other benevolent institutions. From one of these, Ursinus College, of the German Reformed Church, of which he is trustee, he received this year the degree of Doctor of Laws. But the fact that clings to the memory in our changeful times is the twenty-six year pastorate, and the augmenting influence of it. Other fields in plenty have called, but a man does well in continuing to invest his life where former investment has proven profitable.

CORRESPONDENCE

San Rafael, November 6, 1911.

To Reverend John W. Dinsmore, D. D.,
San Jose, Calif.

My dear Doctor Dinsmore: Many years ago I learned to respect and admire your vigorous intellect, your strong independent spirit and your courage in maintaining what you believe to be the truth. You are a fighter in the best sense of that term; earnest, faithful and fearless in attack and defense, and you have won a host of friends and followers, of whom it has long been my boast and happiness to count myself one of the most loyal.

It is because of your well established position as a leader in the Church, and my sincere respect for your ability to lead, and also your wide reputation as an ecclesiastical lawyer, that I take it for granted that you are the author as you were the enthusiastic and successful promoter of the Preamble and Resolution adopted at the last meeting of Synod in the case of Professor Day.

You may imagine therefore my surprise on reading this action of the Synod, to find it so much at variance with the law and constitution of the Church, and even with the Civil Law, which protects every man in his rights. The whole deliverance is a distinct usurpation.

In officially declaring Dr. Day to be "out of harmony with the standards of our Church, and not a proper instructor of young men entering the ministry," the Synod has made a serious attack upon the reputation and means of livelihood of a member of the Presbytery of Benicia in good standing, and that not in the way of judicial process. Indeed, you will be the first to agree with me that the Synod has no jurisdiction whatever over Dr. Day as a presbyter, except on an appeal from a decision of Presbytery.

I hold therefore that this public and widely published declaration that Dr. Day is "unsound," and "unfit" to teach in our seminary, especially in view of his repeated acquittal by the only court which has tried him, is both unfair and criminally libelous.

You will claim, however, that the Synod did not condemn him as a presbyter, but simply as a professor in the seminary which is under its authority and control. But allow me to call your attention to the "Plan of the Seminary," which, as you will admit, is a part of the Constitutional Law of the Church, adopted by the Synod, and under which Dr. Day received his appointment as professor. (Article 2, Section 9.)

"The Board of Directors shall inspect the fidelity of the professors, especially in regard to the doctrines actually taught, and if after due inquiry and examination, they (the Board of Directors) shall judge that any professor is either (1) unsound in faith, (2) opposed to the fundamental principles of Presbyterian Church Government, (3) immoral in his conduct, (4) unfaithful to his trust or (5) incompetent to the discharge of his duties, it shall be the duty of the Board to remove him and appoint another in his place, which transaction, together with the reasons for it, shall be duly reported to the Synod at the next meeting."

You will notice how carefully this law has limited the powers of Synod, and how distinctly it has established and guarded the authority of the Board of Directors, and fixed their responsibility. It is for the directors to inspect the fidelity of the professors, it is for them to make inquiry and examination, and above all it is for them and them alone to **JUDGE**.

In all this the Synod has no jurisdiction whatever, no right of trial, no authority to acquit or condemn. Synod elects the directors, and there its power ceases, with the one exception contained in Article 2, Section 13. "The Board of Directors shall nominate and elect all professors, subject to the approval of the Synod and the Assembly."

Of course it may approve or disapprove the reports which the Directors from time to time make of their acts, but with the single exception just noted, their approval or disapproval carries no weight of authority.

This is the law, clear, distinct, unequivocal, and binding alike upon the Synod and the Directors. Synod cannot order or direct the Directors, and their attempt to do so in the resolution under consideration, is a ridiculous usurpation of authority, as audacious as it is paltry.

Nor have the Directors any right to obey such an order. They cannot proceed to remove any professor unless after due inquiry and examination they (personally and individually) judge him to be either unsound in faith, or opposed to the fundamental principles of Church Government, or immoral in his conduct, or unfaithful to his trust, or incompetent to the discharge of his duties. These, and these alone, are the grounds upon which they can act, and then only on their own judgment, based upon their own investigation. As you well know the Board of Directors has on two occasions conducted a most thorough and patient examination of Dr. Day's alleged unsoundness in the faith, and as a result of these examinations has twice judged him to be sound in the faith, and declared that there is no good reason for his removal. This judgment is thus far final and decisive, and should the Directors now, without further examination and inquiry, and simply because of this illegal action of the Synod, vote for his removal, they would not only shirk the responsibility of their office and violate one of the first principles of justice, but their action would be legally void and without effect.

Certainly you must acknowledge that the Board would put itself in a very absurd light to sentence a man whom they themselves have acquitted, after trial. But after all the most serious and evil result of such action would be the precedent established, viz.—that a majority vote of Synod could override the deliberate

decisions of the Board of Directors, and in spite of the clear provision of the Plan compel the removal of any professor not acceptable to such majority.

(And, if the Synod can do that, why may it not also, by a majority vote, appoint the Professor?) The framers of the Plan placed the Directors between the Synod and the Seminary to protect the latter from the hasty, ill considered, and often prejudiced votes of the ever changing majorities of our annual Synods, and you, Dr. Dinsmore, would be the first to recognize the wisdom of this arrangement.

Indeed, if my memory serves me, you were, when a director, a very zealous and strenuous defender of the rights of the Board. You must admit that it is rather confusing to your friends, to find you throwing all the great weight of your influence into an effort to break down the law, and with splendid energy striving to destroy the Plan of the Seminary, and ride rough-shod over the prerogatives of the Board.

There is a legal way, as you well know, toward the end you have in view. It demands time and patience to pursue it, and there are possibilities of failure, but that surely is no good reason why you should desert it in order to accomplish by a lawless coup d'etat, what you so eagerly desire.

Very sincerely yours,
ARTHUR CROSBY.

OUR MISSIONARIES IN CHINA'S REVOLUTION

To the Relatives and Friends of Missionaries in China:

We deeply sympathize with the strain through which you are passing and in our prayers for our devoted missionaries we do not forget those at home who are in such anxiety regarding them. The situation is changing so rapidly that any explanation today would probably need revision before it could reach you, while the cable dispatches in the daily papers give you as full and late information as we possess. There has not yet been time for letters from the field to arrive. When they come, the same steamer which brings them will, of course, bring others from the missionaries directly to you. As these letters will probably contain the same information as those which come to the Board, it will not be necessary to send you copies of our letters. If, however, your information should be delayed or prove unsatisfactory, we shall be happy, at your request, to send copies of what we have. If any cable comes to us which affects particular missionaries, we shall immediately transmit it to the relatives and friends whose names have been given to us for this purpose by the missionaries and to others who ask to have their names added to our list. Thus far no such cables have been received, except one, stating that the Rev. A. R. Kepler, of the Hunan Mission, was accidentally struck by a stray bullet while watching a battle from the roof of a building in the Japanese concession in Hankow. His injury, while serious, is not believed to be fatal. The other cables that we have had have stated in general that all our missionaries are safe, the last one adding: "Every protection has been afforded."

Missionaries understand that if any disaster occurs to any missionary or station, they are to cable directly to the Board. In the absence of such cables, relatives should not be alarmed by newspaper reports, which are sometimes based on unfounded rumors.

The Board is in communication with the State Department in Washington, which, of course, receives frequent advices from its diplomatic and consular representatives in China and which has promised to keep us informed of anything which it may receive affecting our missionaries. The only information of this kind thus far transmitted is that the Legation at Peking has advised American women and children who are in the rear of the Imperial Army along the line of the Peking-Hankow railway to withdraw to places of safety. This probably relates to the missionaries of other Boards who are at stations along the southern part of that line, and it can hardly refer to our missionaries at Paoting-fu and Shunte-fu, who are at the northern and nearer the capital. The fact that no cable has been received from either of these stations strengthens this view.

The duty of superintending the work and movements of all our missionaries in China and of advising both them and the Board as to what precautions should be taken is centralized in the China Council, which is composed of eight able and experienced missionaries representing all our missions in China and under the chairmanship of the Rev. J. Walter Lowrie, D.D., who has resided in China for twenty-eight years and whose ability, wisdom and standing with Chinese and foreigners alike are widely known. It should also be borne in mind that the revolution, thus far at least, is not anti-foreign but anti-dynastic, and that the revolutionists appear to be exercising special care that foreigners shall not be molested, as they do not wish to give foreign nations any excuse for intervening. The fact that it is to the interest of the revolutionists to avoid foreign complications is an effective guarantee for the safety of missionaries.

And yet we cannot overlook the fact that a period of internecine strife is one in which the passions of men are apt to be inflamed, and that the position of the missionaries is one of peculiar difficulty and possible peril. Much depends upon their courage and wisdom and their fidelity to the interests of the cause of Christ and to the Chinese Christians. They keenly feel this and will not be found wanting. It is for us who are at home to uphold them by giving in unstinted measure our confidence, our moral support, and our earnest prayers to God in their behalf.

In behalf of the Board,
ARTHUR J. BROWN, Secretary.

MISSION CABLES

Safety of Missionaries in China

The Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City, recently cabled to the China Council, which represents all the Presbyterian Missions in China, that the Board gave the Council large discretion in dealing with Mission interests which are affected by the revolution; that we advised special care for the safety of the women and children; that men should remain at their stations wherever practicable and that the Council should keep the Board fully advised of developments, by cable is necessary. The Board has just received the following cable from Shanghai:

"Mission stations are well and safe up to the present as far as we know."

Also from Paotingfu, China, November 1, 1911: "Our Chihli missionaries not disturbed.—China Council." (This means that the missionaries at Peking, Paotingfu and Shuntefu are safe.—A. W. Halsey).

From Persia the Following Cable is Received:

"There is much suffering. Relief greatly needed."

From letter of the Rev. R. M. Labaree, Urumia, Persia: "The political clouds are getting blacker every day. All Azerbaijan is in turmoil and any day the storm may strike us here in Urumia. They say that both the governors of Khoi and Salmas have fled. When they, together with our governor, will have to flee elsewhere, remains to be seen. I don't anticipate any trouble or danger for ourselves, but oh! the poor people."

"The Pacific Christian," the journal of the Disciples on this Coast, has ceased independent publication, and its place is taken by a Coast edition of the "Christian-Evangelist," published at St. Louis. Three pages are given to church news from this territory, and the former editor is retained on the staff of the Eastern paper. The new plan is in the interests of economical management. We believe, however, that the churches will sorely miss their own, well edited local paper, in their mission advance on the Pacific.

THOMAS DAY

Order of Presbyterian Synod Rejected by Theological School Directors.

DAY WRITES TO THE BOARD

Claims Views of the Higher Critics Do Not Make Him a Heretic.

The board of directors of the San Francisco Theological Seminary, the school of the Presbyterian church located at San Anselmo, has refused to follow the direction of the Presbyterian Synod, and call upon Professor Thomas Franklin Day to resign because of his alleged heretical view on the subject of Old Testament literature.

At their meeting on Thursday the directors of the divinity school voted not to ask Professor Day to resign, although the board had been instructed by the last synod to secure and accept his resignation.

It is questions of the authorship of the Pentateuch; whether the story of Jonah is history or parable; whether Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial, and such problems of the higher criticism that have caused the lack of sympathy between the professor and the synod. For two years the synod has been seeking the proper way to declare Professor Day a heretic and to remove him from his chair of Old Testament literature at San Anselmo, but the board of directors of the seminary has each time refused to call for his resignation.

Finally the synod named men for the board of directors of the seminary who, it was understood, would act promptly in ousting the alleged heretic. It looked very much as if the professor was to face a well selected jury. But when the board met on Thursday there was a majority in favor of keeping Professor Day and his opinions in the seminary.

WRITES TO THE BOARD.

Under these circumstances some people have asked why the professor does not simplify the situation by resigning of his own volition. His answer is that the views he holds are not in conflict with the fundamental standards of his church, and that to resign would be to deny his own convictions. In this state of mind he has written a letter to the board of directors of the seminary, which is as follows:

SAN ANSELMO, Cal., November 7, 1911.—To the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Theological Seminary—Dear Brethren: I have received from the stated clerk of the synod of California a copy of the resolution adopted by that body requesting me to resign my position as professor of Old Testament literature and exegesis in the San Francisco Theological Seminary, and in the event of my not complying with the request directing you to remove me from this position. Both the request for my resignation and the direction for my removal are based upon a declaration of belief that I am "out of harmony with the standards of our church and not a proper instructor of young men entering our ministry."

As the resignation if tendered would be presented to you, I deem it fitting and necessary to lay before you the reasons which lead me to decline to accede to the request.

1. In the first place, I have never been declared to be out of harmony with the standards of our church by any ecclesiastical tribunal acting in its proper capacity as a judge in the matter. Twice the board of directors has met the question in a way that leaves no shadow of suspicion resting on my orthodoxy. When the synod entered upon a consideration of my answers to certain questions which had been propounded to me it was distinctly affirmed that the proceedings were in no sense intended to be judicial. If the majority of the synod believed me to be at variance with the standards, instead of placing on record that belief and proceeding to act thereon it was not only their right but their duty to instruct the presbytery of Benicia to take action in

seminary.

WRITES TO THE BOARD.

Under these circumstances some people have asked why the professor does not simplify the situation by resigning of his own volition. His answer is that the views he holds are not in conflict with the fundamental standards of his church, and that to resign would be to deny his own convictions. In this state of mind he has written a letter to the board of directors of the seminary, which is as follows:

SAN ANSELMO, Cal., November 7, 1911.—To the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Theological Seminary—Dear Brethren: I have received from the stated clerk of the synod of California a copy of the resolution adopted by that body requesting me to resign my position as professor of Old Testament literature and exegesis in the San Francisco Theological Seminary, and in the event of my not complying with the request directing you to remove me from this position. Both the request for my resignation and the direction for my removal are based upon a declaration of belief that I am "out of harmony with the standards of our church and not a proper instructor of young men entering our ministry."

As the resignation if tendered would be presented to you, I deem it fitting and necessary to lay before you the reasons which lead me to decline to accede to the request.

1. In the first place I have never been declared to be out of harmony with the standards of our church by any ecclesiastical tribunal acting in its proper capacity as a judge in the matter. Twice the board of directors has met the question in a way that leaves no shadow of suspicion resting on my orthodoxy. When the synod entered upon a consideration of my answers to certain questions which had been propounded to me it was distinctly affirmed that the proceedings were in no sense intended to be judicial. If the majority of the synod believed me to be at variance with the standards, instead of placing on record that belief and proceeding to act thereon it was not only their right but their duty to instruct the presbytery of Benicia to take action in the matter as provided by the constitution of the church. Until this is done I have a right to claim immunity from injurious reflections upon my doctrinal soundness.

2. For in the second place this real, though covert, accusation touches my standing as a minister before it affects my status as a professor. I am first a minister, then a professor. I am a professor because I was first a minister. It is impossible to separate my ministerial from my professorial character when the question at issue is that of my conformity or non-conformity to the standards. Whoever impugns the one, by implication assails the other. If the grounds on which this request ultimately rests were valid I would be ineligible to any pulpit in our church. I can not face a charge so serious as this without wondering whether the supporters of this resolution realized the injury they were doing.

3. But, thirdly, I can not rest the case here. I will go further. I solemnly declare that I am not 'out of harmony with the standards of our church.' I have time and again affirmed my loyalty to the confessional system of doctrine, and I reiterate that affirmation here. My attitude to that system has undergone no change since the time of my ordination. On the great essential doctrines of the gospel, as set forth in the confession of faith and the catechisms of the Presbyterian church, I am in hearty agreement with those who accept and adopt the same. Absolute uniformity of belief is neither possible nor desirable. No two Presbyterians think exactly alike. There are permissible variations within the standards which might on too rigid a construction be called departures therefrom. I claim no liberty that is not safeguarded by the confession itself. If my doctrinal soundness is called in question by those who know me but slightly, I have a right to appeal to those who know me best. And if this is not enough, I have a right to demand a stay of proceedings until I have been adjudged guilty by the only tribunal having the right to try me.

4. To accede to this request would be virtually to confess that the implied accusation is true. It would be to consent to what I believe to be not only unfounded, but injurious. Neither could I tender my resignation in order to put you to a test. That would be an insincerity. My resignation, if voluntary, ought to mean either that I wish to be relieved of the duties of my chair or that I am convinced it is demanded by an inexorable necessity.

Finally, I hold now as I have constantly held in the past, that as a professor in this seminary I am amenable directly and solely to your authority and direction. I am hedged about, as are you, by chartered provisions and regulations as laid down in the plan of the seminary. To resign in the present instance, for the reason that the synod requests it, would be to disregard your exclusive rights in the premises. This I cannot do. Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS FRANKLIN DAY.

Special Dispatch to the "Chronicle."

ON BOARD SPECIAL EXCURSION TRAIN, PHOENIX (Ariz.), November 10.—Governor Sloane of Arizona, in a speech delivered to the members of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition delegation of boosters, who arrived here today, declared that his State would erect a State building at the 1915 world's fair. This statement was enthusiastically received by the fifty-seven excursionists who crowded the Governor's private office in the Capitol.

"We believe in reciprocity in Arizona," said Sloane. "You are down here to see our fair, and I assure you you are welcomed by each one of us. I am going to see your exposition, of course, in 1915, and not only that, but we are going to be represented at your fair by the finest exhibit we can get together and by as fine a State house as our limited means will permit us to build.

"I feel the compliment of your call, as I know there are many distinguished men in your party. You have the greatest city on the Pacific Coast. We feel very near to you because in recent years you were our nearest city, and all the old-timers look upon San Francisco as their own city, and we have not got over the habit of regarding San Francisco as our metropolis, in a sense.

"I had the pleasure of being with you a short time ago and was tremendously impressed with the energy that prevails in modern San Francisco, and I was greatly impressed with the plans that you have laid out for your exposition. Judging by the energy you are showing at this early date, there is no doubt in my mind that you are going to have the greatest fair the world has ever seen."

Frank L. Brown, one of the directors of the exposition company, thanked the Chief Executive for his sentiments, and three hearty cheers were given for Sloane.

GIVEN GOLDEN KEY.

On the arrival of the special train this morning Secretary Harry Welch of the State Fair Association and a committee of citizens, headed by Mayor Christy and General Sampson, formerly a member of Congress, welcomed them. Frank L. Brown was given a golden key four feet long as evidence that the city was turned over to the boosters. Brown carried it around for an hour, but it proved too great a task and he placed it in a safe deposit vault for safe keeping.

Headed by Colonel George H. Pippy and Mayor Christy, the delegation marched uptown. Each booster carried a flag, and throughout the line of march they sang boosting songs and yelled their slogans. Automobiles were furnished the entire party and they were shown the entire valley and also taken to the State Fair grounds. In the evening Governor Sloane, Mayor Christy and General Sampson were tendered a dinner at the Hotel Adams by the boosters' committee. Among those present were: Duncan McKinlay, Arthur G. Fisk, Frederick J. Koster, William J. Dutton, Frank L. Brown, Frederick S. Myrtle, F. C. Parker, Colonel George H. Pippy, A. C. Rulofson, R. J. Tyson, E. H. Tryon, C. A. Cook, B. S. Hubbard and Louis Levy.

Moving pictures of the ground-breaking at San Francisco were shown to nearly 10,000 people in the streets of Phoenix tonight and were greatly appreciated. Duncan McKinlay delivered a lecture on the Panama canal at the local theater and the moving pictures were again shown. Arthur G. Fisk addressed the Postmasters of Arizona today, and is scheduled to give them a further talk tomorrow.

Tomorrow is exposition day at the State Fair. A special programme has been arranged by the local management. In the evening the delegation is to be given a dinner by the Board of Trade.

The splendid showing made by the visitors has won the approval of the citizens, and they also comment on the fact that such leading business men of San Francisco could sacrifice their time to make such a long journey. This has had a great effect, and the people of Phoenix promise splendid co-operation.

The songs and yells adopted by the "Flying Legion," as the boosters are called, have made a great hit. Whenever the latter gather, Charles Brandenstein leads them in regular college style, and the concentrated noise is sufficient to raise any roof.

Cresta Blanca and other vintages were dispensed by C. A. Cook, Charles J. Wetmore and Colonel Pippy. These souvenir bottles were given as samples of California's wine industry. Poppy badges, buttons and fancy crackers were also handed out by the boosters.

A special wireless message was sent Charles C. Moore by Frank L. Brown, apprising the president of the exposition of the success of the excursion.

DR. BROWN IS INDUCTED INTO CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE.

Proposes Community of Interest for Two Big Universities.

Special Dispatch to the "Chronicle."

NEW YORK, November 10.—Delegates from more than 125 American and several foreign colleges today saw Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown inducted into office as chancellor of New York University.

The ceremonies in the auditorium of the library building were attended by a distinguished gathering, including Senator Root, British Embassador Bryce, Mayor Gaynor and Andrew Carnegie.

Rev. Dr. George Alexander presented the charter and statutes and the great seal to the chancellor.

Dr. Brown in his address proposed something like a community of interest for New York and Columbia Universities and the College of the City of New York.

CAVALIERI TO GET $70,000 TO AGREE TO DIVORCE.

Special Dispatch to the "Chronicle."

NEW YORK, November 10.—Robert W. Chanler, the husband of Mlle. Lina Cavalieri, is on his way to Europe. With him is his counsel, Sidney Harris. Have they gone to wind up the Chanler-Cavalieri divorce settlement matter? Nobody will say.

What seems to be a well-grounded report reached here two weeks ago that arrangements had been concluded by which, in consideration of $70,000, [illegible] had consented to

William J. Dutton, Frank L. Brown, Frederick S. Myrtle, F. C. Parker, Colonel George H. Pippy, A. C. Rulofson, R. J. Tyson, E. H. Tryon, C. A. Cook, B. S. Hubbard and Louis Levy.

Moving pictures of the ground-breaking at San Francisco were shown to nearly 10,000 people in the streets of Phoenix tonight and were greatly appreciated. Duncan McKinlay delivered a lecture on the Panama canal at the local theater and the moving pictures were again shown. Arthur G. Fisk addressed the Postmasters of Arizona today, and is scheduled to give them a further talk tomorrow.

Tomorrow is exposition day at the State Fair. A special programme has been arranged by the local management. In the evening the delegation is to be given a dinner by the Board of Trade.

The splendid showing made by the visitors has won the approval of the citizens, and they also comment on the fact that such leading business men of San Francisco could sacrifice their time to make such a long journey. This has had a great effect, and the people of Phoenix promise splendid co-operation.

The songs and yells adopted by the "Flying Legion," as the boosters are called, have made a great hit. Whenever the latter gather, Charles Brandenstein leads them in regular college style, and the concentrated noise is sufficient to raise any roof.

Cresta Blanca and other vintages were dispensed by C. A. Cook, Charles J. Wetmore and Colonel Pippy. These souvenir bottles were given as samples of California's wine industry. Poppy badges, buttons and fancy crackers were also handed out by the boosters.

A special wireless message was sent Charles C. Moore by Frank L. Brown, apprising the president of the exposition of the success of the excursion.

DR. BROWN IS INDUCTED INTO CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE.

Proposes Community of Interest for Two Big Universities.

Special Dispatch to the "Chronicle."

NEW YORK, November 10.—Delegates from more than 125 American and several foreign colleges today saw Dr. Elmer Ellsworth Brown inducted into office as chancellor of New York University.

The ceremonies in the auditorium of the library building were attended by a distinguished gathering, including Senator Root, British Embassador Bryce, Mayor Gaynor and Andrew Carnegie.

Rev. Dr. George Alexander presented the charter and statutes and the great seal to the chancellor.

Dr. Brown in his address proposed something like a community of interest for New York and Columbia Universities and the College of the City of New York.

CAVALIERI TO GET $70,000 TO AGREE TO DIVORCE.

Special Dispatch to the "Chronicle."

NEW YORK, November 10.—Robert W. Chanler, the husband of Mlle. Lina Cavalieri, is on his way to Europe. With him is his counsel, Sidney Harris. Have they gone to wind up the Chanler-Cavalieri divorce settlement matter? Nobody will say.

What seems to be a well-grounded report reached here two weeks ago that arrangements had been concluded by which, in consideration of $70,000, Mlle. Cavalieri had consented to a divorce and the withdrawal of her claims to the Chanler estate.